Ī	Case 3:09-cv-00637-RCJ-VPC Document 177 Filed 09/21/12 Page 1 of 2
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6 7	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
10	
11	JASON LEE SONNTAG, )
12	Plaintiff, ) 3:09-ev-00637-ECR-VPC
13	vs. ) ORDER
14	GURRES, et al.,
15	Defendants. )
16	This action is a <i>pro se</i> civil rights complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Federal
17	courts must conduct a preliminary screening in any case in which a prisoner seeks redress from a
18	governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. See 28 U.S.C.
19	§ 1915A(a). In its review, the court must identify any cognizable claims and dismiss any claims that
20	are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted or seek monetary
21	relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1),(2). On
22	July 1, 2010, this Court entered a screening order in this action, dismissing some claims and
23	defendants, while allowing others to proceed. (ECF No. 11).
<ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>	Presently before the Court is a motion for clarification of the Court's screening order, filed by
26	defendants on July 10, 2012. (ECF No. 168). Plaintiff has filed no opposition to the motion. In the
20	motion, defendants point out that in the screening order, this Court determined that plaintiff fails to

1	state a cognizable claim against defendants Furcher and Sturm in Count V of the complaint. (ECF
2	No. 11, at p. 7). This is an accurate characterization of the Court's screening order. Plaintiff did no
3	allege facts anywhere in the complaint to state a cognizable claim against defendants Furcher and
4	Sturm. As such, these two defendants should have been dismissed from this action in the screening
5	order. The Court grants defendants' motion for clarification and now dismisses defendants Furcher
6	and Sturm from this action, as specified below. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a); 28 U.S.C.
7	§ 1915A(b)(1),(2).
8	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that defendants' motion for clarification (ECF No. 168) i
9	GRANTED.
10	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendants Furcher and Sturm are DISMISSED WITH
11	PREJUDICE from this action.
12	Dated this 21st day of September, 2012.
13 14	Edward C. Reed.
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	